# MINUTES OF THE MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

September 6, 2000 Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Ocotillo Room 302 North First Avenue Phoenix, Arizona

### **VOTING MEMBERS**

\* Carl Doak, Chandler Mark Weiner, Gilbert \* Pat Thurman, Glendale

David Fitzhugh for David Ramirez, Goodyear

Ted Collins, MCDOT

Doug Davis, Mesa Stacy Caudell, Peoria

Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.) Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water)

\* Rod Ramos, Scottsdale Andy Goh, Tempe

### ADVISORY MEMBERS

\* James Pulice, Jr., AGC Jim Grose, AGC Paul Nebeker, UTCA

Tom Domizi, UTCA

\* Jeff Benedict, ARPA

Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering

- \* Gene Larson for Mike Bonar, ACEA
- \* Sean Goris, ACEA

### **MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF**

Paul Ward

\* Laura Stegall

### **GUESTS/VISITORS**

Brian B Pirooz, Peoria

Paul Puris, Sandvick Equipment & Supply Co.

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m.

#### 2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the minutes from the meeting of August 9, 2000. Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote with no exceptions. Jeff Van Skike seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays were recorded.

<sup>\*</sup> Members not attending or represented by proxy.

### 3. Submitted Cases:

- a. Case 00-03 Detail 210 Speed Hump: Andy Goh provided copies of the latest detail for review and comment by the committee. Doug Davis discussed his comments regarding the edge treatment of the asphalt. The detail presented in the meeting by Andy included Doug's comments. Jeff Van Skike asked the members why the asphalt edges were milled or removed. Most members felt that the edge treatment will help hold the new asphalt in place and keep it from raveling or peeling up. Both Phoenix and Gilbert are testing the placement of the asphalt directly on the existing surface without millings or removal. David Fitzhugh questioned the asterisk on the plan view note. Because of the change in Note 7, the asterisk should be removed. Also, the word "asphalt" was miss spelled in Note 7B. Mark Weiner introduced a motion to vote on the case submitted in the meeting with the two exceptions noted above. Jeff Van Skike seconded the motion. The case was approved with a vote of 6 yes, 1 no (Mesa), 0 abstained and 3 absent.
- b. Case 00-04 Detail Standard Trench Plating Detail Andy Goh provided copies of the latest detail for review and comment by the committee. Paul Nebeker noted that the quotations around the type numbers should be removed and the number one looks like a Roman Numeral One and not an English Number One. Jeff Van Skike introduced a motion to vote on the case submitted in the meeting with the two exceptions as noted above. Ted Collins seconded the motion. The case was approved with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained and 3 absent.
- c. **Case 00-05 Miscellaneous Corrections:** Doug Davis submitted a typo in Section 321.5.5. The word "machine" should be "matching". The change was assigned a case number of 00-05F. This case will be voted on in the next meeting.
- d. Case 00-08 Section 610 & 759 Steel Pipe: Within the past month, Tom Domizi met with Rod Ramos and determined that the case as submitted was in the same format as the steel cylinder pipe. In turn, the subcommittee did not meet as discussed in last month's meeting. Tom provided a packet of material to support his position that MAG is a guideline and not a design criteria. Gene Larson of Entellus provided and discussed a letter written by Mike Bonar in support of the case. Doug noted that the proposed case will allow pipes as small as 6" be placed as distribution mains. Gene did not consider the smaller pipes in his letter but with the new linings now on the market, did not believe that they will create any major problems. Tom placed the smaller size pipe in the case for pumping stations, etc. and not for distribution mains. Roger Olsen has several questions/concerns regarding the pipe. Roger provided a copy to Tom for his review and comments.
- e. Case 00-10 Section 750.3 Joint Requirements: Doug Davis noted that with the number of restraint joint suppliers wanting to get on the list, the list is becoming quite long. Doug suggested to Roger that a generic description should be looked into next year. Mark Weiner commented that the list would assist the smaller cities. Roger Olsen introduced a motion to vote on the case (Revision dated July 5, 2000). Mark Weiner seconded the motion. The case was approved with a vote of 7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained and 3 absent.

# 4. General Discussion:

a. Doug Davis requested the members comments, mark ups, etc. on the English electronic details. Doug was the only member that had comments. He placed his comments in three groups. The first group were comments directly related to the conversion to English. The second group were changes in the details not completed by the original firm who designed the Metric Details. When the Metric Details were drawn, the committee gave the design firm direction on selected items. Examples are the consolidation the notes in one area of the detail, delete all quantities on the details, etc. In the case of the quantities, all of the quantities were removed from the details except one (Detail 501). The third group was suggestions to make the details clearer and easer to read and understand.

# 5. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:48 p. m.